From: chdsforums@nps.edu
To: cbagby@bakersfieldpd.us
Subject: CHDS C&T: new posts to 1905/1906 Orientation
Date: Sunday, July 14, 2019 6:01:07 PM

Warning: This email originated from outside the City of Bakersfield. Think before you click!

1905/1906 Orientation

1 new posts to Orientation in the last hour

Richard Ridlon has posted to:

What is working and what is not working in homeland security?

After twenty-nine years in law enforcement at the local, state and federal level, including the old U.S. Customs Service, I can say with certainty that the development and deployment of new technology is something that is working well in homeland security. On August 20, 2018 U.S. Customs and Border Protection rolled out a facial recognition system at Dulles International Airport. On August 23, 2018 the facial recognition system detected a Congolese citizen trying to enter the United States posing as a French citizen[1]. According to U.S. Customs and Border Protection, six air travellers have been intercepted using false identification, 135 travellers have been intercepted at pedestrian border crossings using facial recognition and over 7,000 people have been identified as overstaying there visas[2].

The second technological advancement I believe is working is new radio systems that provide communication across multiple agencies. I have personally been able to find a frequency available to partners from other states in addition to local partner agencies. Effective communication is the key to the National Incident Management System and effective unified command centers.

The deployment of new technology is working well, but is also something that can be improved in homeland defense. The adaptation of military technology to homeland security and public safety agencies in general is often rushed and not always appropriate for the given mission. U.S. Customs and Border Protection fields a fleet of Predator B drones, as well as smaller hand launched drones. The use of these drones are not ideal. They are not only far more costly to operate than manned aircraft, but they are also prohibited by FAA regulations from flying in airspace that would allow optimal performance[3]. From 2013 through 2016 CBP drones accounted for .5% of apprehensions at a cost of $32,000 per apprehension[4].

As someone who benefits greatly from advancements in technology, I continually see an overreliance on technology and the rushing to fit a new technology into an area where it is not the right fit. Poorly deployed technology can be more of a hindrance than a benefit.

[1]https://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/local-media-release/cbp-washington-dulles-

international-airport-intercepted-imposter-using

[2]https://thehill.com/policy/transportation/448643-cbp-says-it-has-caught-over-100-imposters-out-of-19-million-scanned-by

[3]. Office of Inspector General, “U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s Unmanned Aircraft System Program Does Not Achieve Intended Results or Recognize All Costs of Operations,” Department of Homeland Security, OIG-15-17, December 24, 2014, https://www.oig.dhs.gov/assets/Mgmt/2015/OIG_15-17_Dec14.pdf.

[4]Government Accountability Office, “Additional Actions Needed to Strengthen”; and United States Border Patrol, “Total Illegal Alien Apprehensions by Fiscal Year,” https://www.cbp.gov/sites/default/files/assets/documents/2017-Dec/BP%20Total%20Apps%2C%20Mexico%2C%20OTM%20FY2000-FY2017.pdf.

There are 0 comments on this post so far.

View or respond to this post

You have been automatically subscribed to posts on this site. All posts will be emailed to you. Change your email preferences.

CHDS 1905/1906 C&T - NPS Center for Homeland Defense and Security